

Serial No. 10/626,580

Docket No. SI-0039

Amdt. dated February 7, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2005

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 1-26, 37 and 38 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 27, 31 and 32 to further clarify the invention. Claims 27-36 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0092451 (Holloway et al.). Claims 27, 29, 32, and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,867,784 (Lantto). Claims 31 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,867,784 over Lantto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,905,789 (Will).

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 27, 28, 30, 32, 33 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Holloway et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Holloway et al. discloses proximity of a mobile phone to a preferred phone being detected by radio frequency or Bluetooth equipped device, triggering automatic forwarding of calls for the mobile phone to the preferred telephone number. Automatic forwarding without user intervention can facilitate use of hands-free devices in vehicles and allow receipt of phone calls to mobile phone on regular lines on a home or office situation.

Regarding claims 27 and 32, Applicant submits that Holloway et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, ringing a first

mobile terminal, receiving a request from a second mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal in response to the ringing, transferring the call to the second mobile terminal in response to the request, a second mobile terminal generating a request to pick up the call in response to the ringing, or a processor which receives the request to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal and transfers the call to the second mobile terminal in response to the request.

The Examiner asserts that Holloway et al. discloses these limitations in the abstract, and paragraphs 14, 17, 19, and 20. However, these portions of Holloway et al. merely disclose, as has been noted previously, call forwarding where a first mobile phone using Bluetooth technology determines if it is within range of a second mobile phone, and if so, receives the identity of the second mobile phone such that calls intended for the second mobile phone are forwarded to the first mobile phone. This is not ringing a first mobile terminal and receiving a request from a second mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal in response to the ringing, as recited in the claims of the present application. Holloway et al. does not disclose or suggest anything related to a second mobile terminal making a request in response to the ringing of a first mobile terminal, to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal. In fact, according to Holloway et al., the first phone does not have to ring at all, and actually removes itself from the system after its identity has been passed to the second mobile phone (see, col. 2 paragraph 20). In contrast, according to the limitations in the claims of the

present application, a first mobile terminal rings, and in response to the ringing, a second mobile terminal generates a request to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal.

Regarding claims 28, 30, 33 and 35, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 27 and 32 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Holloway et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 27, 28, 30, 32, 33 and 35 of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 27, 29, 32 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lantto. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Lantto discloses a digital cellular communication system that supports call forwarding with better speech quality by avoiding unnecessary speech decoding when a call is forwarded from one network or exchange to another. A new information element that contains the network code of an originating mobile services switching center (MSC) is added in an initial address message, so that the address of the originating MSC can be properly determined by a terminating MSC or, if call forwarding has been initiated, by a forwarded-to MSC. A structured dialog is used for sending a speech coding request to the originating MSC in which a return

Serial No. 10/626,580

Docket No. SI-0039

Amdt. dated February 7, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2005

result signal acknowledging the request is sent to the correct receiver in the terminating MSC or, if call forwarding has been initiated, in the forwarded-to MSC.

Regarding claims 27 and 32, Applicant submits that Lantto does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, ringing a first mobile terminal, receiving a request from a second mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal in response to the ringing, transferring the call to the second mobile terminal in response to the request, a second mobile terminal generating a request to pick up the call in response to the ringing, or a processor which receives the request to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal and transfers the call to the second mobile terminal in response to the request.

The Examiner assert that Lantto discloses these limitations in col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 47 and col. 8, lines 29-56. However, these portions merely disclose a call forwarding process as was discussed in Applicant's background of the invention. Specifically, Lantto discloses a call forwarding process with better speech quality by avoiding unnecessary speech decoding when a call is forwarded from one network or exchanged to another. Lantto does not disclose or suggest ringing a first mobile terminal and receiving a request from a second mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal in response to the ringing, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, these portions in Lantto do not disclose or suggest a second mobile terminal generating a response to pick up the call directed to the first mobile

Serial No. **10/626,580**

Docket No. **SI-0039**

Amdt. dated February 7, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2005

terminal in response to the ringing, or a processor which receives the request to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal and transfers the call to the second mobile terminal in response to the request. Lantto merely relates to call forwarding. Lantto does not disclose or suggest a first mobile terminal ringing and a second mobile terminal requesting call pick up in response to the ringing.

Regarding claims 29 and 34, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 27 and 32 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Lantto does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 27, 29, 32, and 34 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 31 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lantto in view of Will. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 27 and 32 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicant submits that Will does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Lantto.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of

Serial No. **10/626,580**

Docket No. **SI-0039**

Amdt. dated February 7, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2005

each of claims 31 and 36 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/626,580**

Docket No. **SI-0039**

Amdt. dated February 7, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 27-36 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

Date: February 7, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610